United Nations A/C.3/68/SR.47

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2014

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 47th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 19 November 2013, at 10 a.m.

Chair: Mr. Tafrov ..... (Bulgaria)

Contents

Agenda item 66: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-57010 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 66: Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*)

(a) Rights of indigenous peoples (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.30)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.30: Rights of Indigenous Peoples

1. **Mr. Rossell Arce** (Plurinational State of Bolivia), introducing the draft resolution, said that Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guatemala, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors. The landmark adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples had given the international community a new robust legal framework for the promotion and protection of those rights and Bolivia had been the first country to translate the Declaration into domestic law. The sponsors of the draft resolution were committed to furthering multilateral action in favour of indigenous peoples, through events such as the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples in 2014. Governments and indigenous peoples were invited to convene regional or international events to contribute to the preparations for the Conference. The ongoing efforts to focus global attention on the important role of quinoa and to promote the traditional knowledge of Andean indigenous peoples aimed, inter alia, to guarantee food security and eradicate poverty and to raise awareness on their contribution to social, economic and environmental development.

2. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Armenia, Brazil, Congo, El Salvador, Guyana and Honduras had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.43, A/C.3/68/L.48 and A/C.3/68/L.52)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.43: Right to the Truth

3. **Mr. Fernandez Valoni** (Argentina), introducing the draft resolution, said the right to the truth had become one of the pillars of his country's human rights policy and its promotion was a major aspect of foreign policy. The number of sponsors had risen with each adoption of a resolution on the matter; it was time for the General Assembly to recognize, by consensus, the universal scope of the right to the truth. Argentina had learned that the consequences of impunity were lasting and that societies needed to face their past in order to be able to look towards their future. The sponsors, cognizant of the fact that each country had its own internal specificities, were not attempting to impose a single formula — the main objective of the draft resolution was to establish that each individual and society as a whole had the right to the truth and that it was the duty of States to respect and guarantee that right.

4. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Ecuador, Switzerland and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.48: Combating intolerance, negative stereotyping, stigmatization, discrimination, incitement to violence and violence against persons, based on religion or belief

5. **Ms. Ahmed Hassan** (Djibouti), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, said that the draft sought to build on the good work of Council resolution 16/18, which had established the Istanbul Process to combat intolerance based on religion or belief, and was a natural follow-up to the delicately negotiated consensus resolution of 2012, with only minor technical updates to ensure consistency throughout the text. The language of the twenty-first and twenty-second preambular paragraphs had been refined to reflect additions or deletions of relevant references.

6. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.52: United Nations Human Rights Training and Documentation Centre for South-West Asia and the Arab Region

7. **Ms. Al-Mulla** (Qatar), introducing the draft resolution, said that Azerbaijan, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Pakistan, Tunisia, United States of America and Yemen had joined the sponsors. The support and appreciation shown for the work of the Centre reflected the significance of the draft resolution.

The text encouraged continued engagement of the Centre with other United Nations offices in the region and recognized that constraints on human and financial resources limited the Centre's capacity to respond to regional developments in a timely manner. If the funding issues were addressed, the Centre would be able to perform its crucial role.

8. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Lebanon, Morocco and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.71)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.71: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

9. **The Chair** said that he had been advised that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

10. **Ms. Farngalo** (Liberia) said that a few minor revisions had been made to the draft. In the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "violence and exploitation" had been inserted after "abuse," and the words "and addressing" had been inserted after "responding to"; in the tenth preambular paragraph, the word "integration" had been inserted after "inter alia,". She announced that Belgium, Costa Rica, Estonia, Japan and Republic of Moldova had joined the sponsors.

11. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Croatia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Greece, Honduras, Mexico, Montenegro, Romania, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste and United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.71, as orally revised, was adopted.*

13. **Ms. Juodkaitė Putrimienė** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the plight of refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa was of great concern to European Union member States, particularly as some 25 per cent of the global refugee population lived on the African continent. While the European Union supported the general thrust of the draft resolution, it would welcome a truly transparent and inclusive consultation process in 2014, which would allow Member States the opportunity to discuss some of the issues in more depth and thereby strengthen the resolution.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.67)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.67: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

14. **The Chair** said that he had been advised that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

15. **Mr.** Diyar **Khan** (Pakistan), noting that New Zealand, Paraguay, South Sudan and Tajikistan had joined the sponsors, said that the right to self-determination enjoyed primacy in international law. It had been affirmed and upheld by all major international summits, declarations and resolutions, the Charter of the United Nations, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Adoption of the draft resolution by acclamation would send a strong message regarding the international community's opposition to all acts of foreign aggression and occupation.

16. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belize, Gambia and Haiti had joined the sponsors.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.67 was adopted.*

18. **Mr. Díaz Bartolomé** (Argentina) said that his country fully supported the right to self-determination of peoples, a right that should be interpreted as applicable only to peoples subjected to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and relevant resolutions. The resolution that had just been adopted should be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Political and Decolonization Committee.

19. **Mr. García-Larrache** (Spain) said that while his country fully supported the right to self-determination, there were situations in which the administering Power and the authorities of the territory it had colonized had established a political relationship in their own interest and insisted that there was no colonial link, while still claiming a so-called right to self-determination. That was a distortion of the Charter of the United Nations and of the relevant resolutions.

20. The original population of Gibraltar had had to leave the territory, and the current inhabitants had been installed by the occupying Power for military purposes. Claims to self-determination were therefore untenable. The United Nations considered that the colonial situation of Gibraltar affected the territorial integrity of Spain, and thus had repeatedly called for dialogue on the issue. Spain believed that a solution that respected the rights of Gibraltar's inhabitants could be found, and hoped that the United Kingdom would join it in seeking such a solution.

21. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that the United States of America considered the right of peoples to self-determination to be important and had therefore joined consensus on the resolution. However, the resolution contained multiple misstatements of international law and was inconsistent with current State practices.

22. **Ms. Walker** (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recalled its sovereignty over Gibraltar and the territorial waters surrounding it and reaffirmed that, as a separate territory included by the United Nations in its list of non-self-governing territories since 1946, Gibraltar enjoyed the individual and collective rights accorded by the Charter of the Organization. The 2006 Gibraltar Constitution provided for a modern and mature relationship between Gibraltar and the Government of the United Kingdom. That description would not apply to any relationship based on colonialism.

23. Her Government had a long-standing commitment to the people of Gibraltar that it would not enter into arrangements under which the people of Gibraltar would pass under the sovereignty of another State against their wishes, nor would it enter into a process of sovereignty negotiations with which Gibraltar was not content. While her Government and Gibraltar desired to continue the Trilateral Forum for Dialogue on Gibraltar as the most credible, constructive and practical means of strengthening United Kingdom-Gibraltar-Spain relations for the benefit of all parties, the Forum could not continue its work in the absence of agreement between all parties as to its resumption. Her Government regretted the fact that the Government of Spain had withdrawn from those talks in 2011, and the United Kingdom stood ready to explore new ways of taking forward dialogue and cooperation on issues of mutual importance by any means that fully reflected the interests, rights and responsibilities of the people of Gibraltar. The United Kingdom continued to enjoy strong relations with Spain and would continue to work constructively on all Gibraltar-related issues.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.51 and A/C.3/68/L.54)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.51: Effective promotion of the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities

24. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

25. **Ms. Kalb** (Austria) said that, since the introduction of the draft resolution, Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Estonia, Georgia, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Mauritius, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation San Marino, Slovakia, Ukraine and United Kingdom had become sponsors. She read out an oral revision to the text: in the ninth preambular paragraph, the words "and recalling the paragraphs in resolution 67/292 on multilingualism of 29 August 2013, relating to the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, recognizing that multilingualism is a means of preserving diversity of languages and cultures globally" should be added at the end of the paragraph.

26. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Benin, Greece, New Zealand, Timor-Leste, United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.51, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.54: Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa

28. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications

29. **Ms. Mballa Eyenga** (Cameroon) said that Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, Guinea Bissau, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Kenya, Malawi, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The Subregional Centre would contribute to strengthening national human rights capacities in the subregion and facilitate the establishment of transitional justice mechanisms in countries emerging from conflict.

30. **Mr. Gustafik** said that Albania, Australia, Benin, Eritrea, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Madagascar, Mali, Montenegro, Qatar, Senegal, South Sudan, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America had joined the sponsors.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.54 was adopted.*

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.55/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.76)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.55/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

32. **The Chair** said that the statement of programme budget implications for the draft resolution was contained in document A/C.3/68/L.76.

33. **Ms. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, said that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Israel, Liechtenstein, Norway, Serbia, Seychelles, Switzerland and Turkey had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution had been drafted and negotiated against the backdrop of substantial changes in Myanmar, including the increasing engagement with the international community and important steps towards political reform, national reconciliation and improvement of the human-rights situation. As a result, a significant part of the draft resolution was dedicated to recognizing the positive steps taken.

34. Serious challenges remained, however, and the draft resolution called on the Government of Myanmar to, inter alia, continue releasing prisoners of conscience, to ensure an inclusive peace process and to pursue legal reform to guarantee compatibility with international standards and democratic principles and thus ensure the credibility, transparency and inclusiveness of the 2015 elections. The international community remained concerned about continuing armed conflict in Kachin State, the discrimination and human rights violations affecting various ethnic minorities, especially the Rohingya minority, and the fresh outbreaks of violence in Rakhine State. Lastly, the draft resolution called on the Government to speed up the process of establishing a country office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, which it had committed to doing the previous year.

35. The draft resolution took into account the substantial changes in the country and the Government's increasing engagement with the international community. The European Union had worked closely with Myanmar to produce a draft resolution that reflected both the important strides made over the past year and the main issues of concern still to be addressed. Bilateral consultations had also been held with other delegations with a view to reaching a consensus on the draft resolution.

36. She read out a few oral revisions to the text. First, in paragraph 11, the word "upcoming" in the third line should be deleted. Second, in the first line of paragraph 14, the phrase "expresses concern at continued delays" should be deleted, and the phrase "expresses concern at delays" should be inserted after the word "negotiations" in the second line. She understood that the revisions would enable all delegations to join consensus on the draft resolution.

37. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) welcomed the progress that Burma had made towards building the foundations of a sustainable democracy and commended its Government's continued efforts to fulfil its international commitments, including the dedicated work of the political prisoner review committee and the recent release of 69 political prisoners. While the Government and civil society had made great strides in improving the promotion of human rights, great challenges remained. The situation in Rakhine State was a source of concern, and the Government should take steps to promote civilian protection, improve livelihoods and develop a long-term solution to the crisis in a responsible and sustainable manner. Anti-Muslim sentiment and violence had spread, and the March incident in Meiktila had led to widespread displacement, death and destruction of property. She urged the Government to hold the perpetrators to account, to investigate the failure to protect public order and to take the necessary steps to prevent such tragic episodes from ever recurring. Her country supported the role of the United

Nations in promoting and protecting human rights in Burma in partnership with the Government and civil society through the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, and looked forward to discussing further progress at the next session of the Human Rights Council.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.55/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

39. **Mr. Tin** (Myanmar), speaking in explanation of position, reaffirmed his delegation's principled opposition to the selective tabling of country-specific resolutions. The universal periodic review of the Human Rights Council was the sole monitoring mechanism to address human rights situations in all countries. The promotion and protection of human rights should be based on cooperation, genuine dialogue and strengthening the capacity of Member States to comply with their human rights obligations. Myanmar's well-known drastic policy changes in recent years had included increased international engagement, the establishment of bilateral human rights dialogues with the United States, Japan and the European Union. In keeping with the spirit of cooperation that his country had opted for since the European Union had shifted its policy towards Myanmar to a constructive approach, his delegation had refrained from calling for a vote on the draft resolution, as the text encouraged the ongoing reform process. He welcomed the recognition given to the various positive developments. However, his delegation maintained reservations to paragraphs 5, 10 and 14, which contained sensitive language. Paragraph 5 was replete with unverified allegations. His Government's steps to address human rights issues included strengthening the national human rights commission, enacting legislative reforms and acceding to international instruments.

40. Myanmar regretted the inter-communal violence that had occurred the previous year in Rakhine State. The clashes had been provoked by miscreants who had exploited the newfound freedom and political openness at a time of rapid transition, and had not been an attack on a certain religion. Different faiths were living in peace and harmony elsewhere in the country. His Government had committed to preventing the recurrence of such violence, to attending to humanitarian needs with the support of the international community, and to promoting tolerance, peaceful coexistence and inter-faith dialogue. It had also taken action to hold the perpetrators accountable.

41. His delegation reiterated its long-standing opposition to the use of the term "Rohingya minority". There was no such minority among his country's ethnic groups and the inclusion of that term in the text did not imply recognition by Myanmar. The rights to citizenship, land ownership, movement and access would be considered in accordance with domestic law and the prevailing security conditions in the region.

42. Myanmar had been negotiating with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to reach an agreement on the opening of an office in his country. The opening of any United Nations office must be based on mutually convenient terms and conditions at a pace that was comfortable to the host country; his Government therefore rejected the non-constructive tone and reference to a mandate in paragraph 14 and reserved the right to decide on the mandate of the office to be opened in the country.

43. Given that the democratic transition in Myanmar was proceeding apace and reaping tangible benefits, the time had come to end monitoring of the situation in the country and to remove the issue from the General Assembly's agenda. Allowing a country that had changed for the better to remain subject to censure by the Committee would set a bad precedent. Moreover, there were ample ways for the United Nations and the international community to continue assisting and encouraging Myanmar's democratic transition without resorting to a country-specific resolution.

44. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) said that his delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution because it believed in the importance of sending a united message from the international community in recognition of the positive developments in Myanmar. Japan welcomed the steps taken by Myanmar towards further engagement with the international community. Nevertheless, his Government was concerned about the communal conflict in Rakhine State and was closely following the situation. Japan would continue to extend assistance to Myanmar in support of its reform efforts and believed that its Government would continue to take positive steps so that Member States might re-evaluate the necessity of the country-specific resolution.

45. **Mr. Patriota** (Brazil), acknowledging the positive developments in Myanmar, said that the

situation of ethnic and religious minorities and internally displaced persons should be improved. His Government welcomed the release of political prisoners but was concerned about the situation of those who remained in prison, and also about issues related to freedom of expression, association and assembly, and recent deadly violence in Rakhine State and attacks on Muslim minorities. The adoption of the draft resolution by consensus reflected the progress of the political transition.

46. **Ms. Hewanpola** (Australia) said that the steps towards political and economic reform taken by the Government of Myanmar would bring more peace and prosperity to the country. The election to parliament of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi in April 2012 reflected the new spirit of openness. Her Government welcomed the Myanmar Government's November 2013 release of political prisoners and its commitment to releasing all prisoners of conscience by the end of 2013 and to achieving a nationwide ceasefire with the ethnic armed groups. It was concerned, however, by the intercommunal violence in Rakhine State, which could, if allowed to escalate, jeopardize the progress made. It encouraged Member States to strengthen their engagement with the country and welcomed the Myanmar Government's signing, in September 2013, of an additional protocol to its comprehensive safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Further reforms in Myanmar would obviate the need for the Committee to adopt a country-specific resolution in future years.

47. **Mr. Bamrungphong** (Thailand) said that his Government welcomed the commitment of the Government of Myanmar to democratic reform, national reconciliation and development. The international community should not exert unnecessary political pressure on Myanmar but should help it to address the root causes of issues, in particular those related to socioeconomic development. Although challenges remained in Myanmar, there was no further need for a country-specific resolution to be adopted by the Committee.

48. **Ms. Hernando** (Philippines) said that although her Government did not as a rule support country-specific resolutions, it welcomed the consensus on the draft resolution and the positive developments in Myanmar. It was confident that the progress of the Government of Myanmar towards democracy and the promotion of human rights would be sustained and that in future the General Assembly would need to take no further action on the matter.

49. **Ms. Mørch Smith** (Norway) said that the international community should support Myanmar in its transition to democracy. Her delegation hoped that the Committee's country-specific resolution would become unnecessary if the human rights situation continued to improve.

50. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that the reforms of the Burmese Government had advanced the cause of human rights. Her Government trusted that the dialogue between the Burmese Government and the ethnic armed groups would yield a sustainable solution. It was concerned about the situation of ethnic and religious minorities but would support Burma's transition towards reconciliation and democracy.

51. **Mr. Wang** Min (China) said that the people of Myanmar were ultimately responsible for resolving the difficulties which they continued to face despite the substantial changes in the country. The international community should address those problems objectively and rationally, respecting Myanmar's right to choose its own path towards development on the basis of its specific characteristics. Member States should support the Government's efforts to resolve the problems and to bring stability and amity among the ethnic groups. Country-specific resolutions were not the way forward; the countries responsible for them should address the legitimate concerns of Myanmar rather than table resolutions against it.

52. **Ms. Tham** (Singapore) said that her Government objected on principle to country-specific resolutions, which were selective, divisive, counterproductive and often motivated by politics rather than human rights. Country-specific human rights questions should be addressed through the Human Rights Council and the universal periodic review, which had been established specifically for that purpose. Her delegation would therefore abstain from voting on all country-specific resolutions, a decision which should not be interpreted as taking a position on the human rights situation in the country concerned or as condoning the mistreatment of citizens. Although Myanmar continued to face challenges, her delegation welcomed the Government's reform and reconciliation efforts, including the promotion of interfaith dialogue.

53. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her Government was

committed to the principles of non-intervention, State sovereignty and self-determination, and rejected selective country-specific resolutions adopted on the pretext of human rights concerns. It welcomed initiatives to encourage negotiation and dialogue without the application of undue pressure. Human rights situations should be examined by the Human Rights Council in a spirit of cooperation and impartiality, on the basis of reliable information. The universal periodic review was a valuable tool for the non-selective examination of such situations.

54. **Ms. Furman** (Israel) said that her delegation welcomed the commitment of the Government of Myanmar to political and economic reform, democracy and reconciliation. It welcomed the release of 1,100 political prisoners since 2011, the statement by the President of Myanmar that all prisoners of conscience would be freed by the end of 2013, the Government's engagement with parliament, civil society and the opposition and its attempts to reform legislation and relax media censorship. Further progress would obviate the need for draft resolutions on human rights in Myanmar in future years.

55. **Ms. Nguyen** Cam Linh (Viet Nam) said that her delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution but reiterated its objection to country-specific resolutions. Dialogue, engagement and cooperation, rather than confrontation and criticism, were the best way to promote and protect human rights.

56. **Mr. Kommasith** (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that his delegation did not support country-specific resolutions as a matter of principle, but welcomed the consensus on the draft resolution. It supported the commitment of the Government of Myanmar to the political transition, which should be supported by the international community. Lasting peace in the country would be achieved through dialogue, mutual respect, compromise and the non-politicization of human rights. The Government and people of Myanmar would be encouraged in their efforts if the controversial resolution on the human rights situation in the country were abolished.

57. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that her Government opposed human rights resolutions directed selectively against countries of the South. The Human Rights Council universal periodic review allowed all human rights situations to be considered on the basis of equality and constructive dialogue. Only objective, impartial and non-selective international cooperation would ensure the protection of human rights. Her delegation hoped that no further draft resolutions on human rights in Myanmar would be presented to the Committee.

58. **Ms. Hassan** (Djibouti), speaking on behalf of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC), said that OIC had supported the consensus on the draft resolution, although a number of its member States objected to country-specific resolutions. Over the preceding year it had shared with the States Members of the United Nations its concerns and its willingness to help Myanmar with humanitarian assistance and interfaith and political dialogue. It welcomed the inclusion of its suggestions in the text.

59. At the invitation of the Government of Myanmar, a delegation comprising the OIC Secretary-General, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Djibouti and Turkey, and representatives of the ministries of foreign affairs of various other OIC member States had visited Nay Pyi Taw and Rakhine State in November 2013. The delegation had observed the changes made by the Government of Myanmar with a view to ensuring peace, stability, the rule of law and socioeconomic progress.

60. The Organization welcomed the Government's efforts to reform legislation, including the Constitution, in line with international standards, and called for the repeal of laws restricting fundamental freedoms. In particular, democracy could not be established without addressing the popular resentment of the Rohingya minority and restoring their citizenship. His delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution in the hope that the Government's pledges would be respected by the authorities; the Organization and the international community would continue to monitor the situation. The OIC member States and institutions, including civil society organizations, were ready to provide further humanitarian and rehabilitation assistance in coordination with the Government, without discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity or religion. The Organization and the Government should study the implementation of the 2012 memorandum of cooperation for the provision of humanitarian assistance.

61. Although OIC regretted the comments and reservations of the delegation of Myanmar concerning paragraphs 5, 10 and 15 of the draft resolution, the

problem could be resolved through courageous Government action supported by the international community. Without such action, however, relations among Myanmar's communities could deteriorate. She deplored the destruction of a mosque by a mob in Kyauk Phyu after the departure of the OIC delegation. The communities did not trust one another and the Rohingya Muslim community did not trust the Government. The process of verification for the granting of citizenship should be inclusive, comprehensive and transparent; its success depended on the prospect of full citizenship. The Organization would encourage the Muslim communities to cooperate with the authorities providing that it received the technical details of the verification and citizenship processes and the Government's plans. The 2014 census was an opportunity to build trust with the Rohingya Muslim community.

62. **Ms. Khvan** (Russian Federation) said that one-sided, selective country-specific resolutions did nothing to resolve human rights problems. The primary responsibility for the protection of those rights lay with States themselves, although the international community was called upon to provide technical assistance. The European Union draft resolution on human rights in Myanmar could negatively affect the attitude of the authorities in the country towards cooperation with all parties. Her delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution but saw no need for such documents and believed that in future they would be unnecessary for the Third Committee.

63. **Mr. Mahmoud** (Egypt), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. The resolution sent a strong message to Myanmar, making clear the necessity of continuing constitutional reforms, further improving the human rights situation and abiding by relevant commitments, in particular those pertaining to Muslim minorities. His delegation remained concerned about continued violations, especially concerning the acquisition of citizenship by the Rohingya Muslim minority, the protection of their places of worship and cemeteries, practice of their religious beliefs and non-obstruction of humanitarian assistance to those in need. He welcomed the cooperation extended by the Government of Myanmar during the recent visit of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation to the country and hoped that the coming period would yield tangible improvements in the human rights situation, preventing the Committee from having to adopt similar resolutions at future sessions.

64. **Mr. Kumar** (India) said that his Government supported the reform and reconciliation efforts of the Government of Myanmar, the release of political prisoners, the peace talks with the ethnic groups, including the Kachins, and the proposed national ceasefire. His Government had always advocated engagement by the international community with the Myanmar Government to foster national reconciliation and socioeconomic development, and had thus been encouraged by the presence of the first Myanmar delegation at the September meeting of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General on Myanmar and the Group's decision to work in partnership with Myanmar towards peace and development. The commitment of the President of Myanmar to tolerance, mutual respect, religious freedom and the rule of law should lead to further progress in comprehensively addressing the situation in Rakhine State and the communal violence in the country. His Government had provided $2 million in humanitarian assistance for relief, rehabilitation and community-building measures in Rakhine State. It encouraged Member States to engage with Myanmar to foster reconciliation and economic development.

65. **Mr. Nina** (Albania) said that the reform process in Myanmar needed international support; his Government therefore welcomed the November 2013 visit to the country of the delegation led by the OIC Secretary-General and the Joint Communiqué between the Central Committee for Implementation of Stability and Development in the Rakhine State of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar and OIC. The 2012 General Assembly resolution on the situation of human rights in Myanmar could have been the last such text considered by the Committee if the Government of Myanmar had honoured its assurances regarding the Rohingya minority in Rakhine State. His Government remained concerned about the human rights of that minority. Unless the root causes of discrimination against the Rohingya and other ethnic and religious groups were addressed, the democratization process would not be credible. The Myanmar Government should work with the international community to implement the draft resolution without politicization. Any implied reservation would render those efforts ineffective.

66. **Mr. Kim** Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that his Government objected to country-specific resolutions as a matter of conscience. Since the cause of human rights could be advanced only through dialogue and cooperation, such resolutions should be abandoned.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.